

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ADVANCED VISION SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

JULIA L. LEHMAN, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-cv-01597-APG-NJK

ORDER DENYING PROPOSED
DISCOVERY PLAN

(Docket No. 17)

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan, Docket No. 17, which is hereby **DENIED**. The Local Rules require specific calendar dates to be provided for the deadlines in the scheduling order. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The pending discovery plan provides deadlines triggered off of the filing of an answer in the event the pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction is not granted, without providing any calendar dates as deadlines. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 17 at 2. The Court will not enter the discovery plan since it does not provide calendar dates for the relevant deadlines.

Although not entirely clear, the parties appear to be agreeing to stay discovery in this case pending resolution of the motion to dismiss. To the extent the parties are seeking to stay discovery, they must file a stipulation or motion addressing the relevant factors. *See, e.g., Kabo Tool Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co.*, 2013 U.S. Dist Lexis 53570, *2 (D. Nev. Apr. 15, 2013).

1 Accordingly, the parties are hereby **ORDERED** to file, no later than December 16, 2014,
2 either (1) a discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules or (2) a request to stay discovery
3 pending resolution of the motion to dismiss.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: December 9, 2014

6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28